Andrews University

School of Education

AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF COORDINATORS IN K-12 SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTING CURRICULUM VIDEOCONFERENCING

A Proposal

Presented In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Course

LEAD 880: Dissertation Proposal Development

by

Janine Lim

April 2008

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

For this literature review, I found over 200 research and opinion articles and dissertations on the topic of videoconferencing, specifically those related to curriculum videoconferencing, the implementation of videoconferencing, and the role of the coordinator. Databases searched include Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC, InformaWorld, WilsonSelect, and the EdITLib Digital Library for Information Technology and Education. The main keyword used in searches was "videoconferencing" and "videoconference" and then I used the titles and descriptions to select the articles related to K-12 videoconferencing. In addition, all references from the major literature reviews were collected (Anderson & Rourke, 2005; BECTA, 2003; Cavanaugh, 1999; Greenberg, 2004; Heath & Holznagel, 2002). The literature review for this proposal covers a sampling of those articles and dissertations. The literature review will be expanded more fully for the dissertation.

The focus of this study is the videoconference coordinator and their influence on the utilization of videoconferencing in the school. This study aims to investigate the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing, to integrate videoconferencing in the curriculum, to work with teachers, and the technical and administrative issues that may affect the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing. This study will analyze how these factors may predict the utilization videoconferencing in the school. Therefore, the literature review will examine selected studies on videoconferencing in general and then make a case specifically for the importance of curriculum videoconferencing as defined by connections with content providers and other

classrooms. After establishing that curriculum videoconferencing provides benefits to student learning, this chapter will discuss the studies on implementation of videoconferencing and examine the studies on utilization of videoconferencing. After setting this general background, the specific role of the videoconference coordinator will be examined carefully, including the demographics of the coordinator, the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing, to integrate videoconferencing in the curriculum and to work with teachers. In addition, we will examine the technology factors, specifically location and quality of the videoconference, that may affect the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing. Finally we will look at the coordinator's access to support. This lays the foundation for studying the videoconference coordinator's role in the utilization of curriculum videoconferencing in K-12 schools and this will be covered in the section on the rationale for the study.

Videoconferencing

In this section, we will examine selected studies from the broad category of videoconferencing, examine educational uses of videoconferencing, review the importance of interaction, and determine the need for further research into why some programs are successful.

Videoconferencing allows people in two or more locations to see and hear each other (BECTA, 2003). This technological tool is used by teachers and administrators in education for meetings (Fiege, 2005), professional development and training (Bore, 2005; Hartman & Crook, 1997; Kinnear, McWilliams, & Caul, 2002; Pemberton, Cereijo, Tyler-Wood, & Rademacher, 2004). The most common and traditional use in education is for full length courses (Booth, 2006; Mitchell, 2005; Royal, Bradley, & Lineberry, 2005). Some creative uses of videoconferencing include school-based telehealth care (Young & Ireson, 2003), supervision of student teaching (Dudding, 2004), recruitment (Chapman, 1999), tutoring (McGinnis, 2001), and bringing opportunities to hospitalized students (Weiss, Whiteley, Treviranus, & Fels, 2001)

and incarcerated students (Gilham & Moody, 2001). But this study focuses on curriculum videoconferencing, which includes accessing remote experts from the classroom (Greenberg, 2003; McCombs, Ufnar, & Shepherd, 2007), and engaging in collaborative learning activities with remote classrooms (Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000; Howland & Wedman, 2003; Szente, 2003; Thurston, 2004; Yost, 2001).

This study focuses specifically on curriculum videoconferencing, or those activities that use videoconferencing to address curriculum goals with engaging interactions with scientists, experts, and peers. It is my belief that there is a fundamental difference between using videoconferencing to deliver full courses and using it to bring curriculum enrichment activities to the classroom. Full length courses are generally daily videoconferences (Royal et al., 2005), whereas connections to experts and peers may occur only a few times a year (Keefe, 2003). This difference has implications for implementation as well as differing definitions of utilization. Studies on full course delivery focus on the effectiveness of communication, how well the technology works, whether students are satisfied, and how the instructor adjusts to a new medium. These studies do not have a direct connection to the less frequent use of videoconferencing to enrich the curriculum. However, we will take a cursory review of these studies to examine the traditional uses of videoconferencing. These studies provide a broader context for the research into curriculum videoconferencing in K12 education.

Much of the research discusses the difference between teaching full courses over videoconferencing compared to teaching a face to face class (Amirian, 2003, Oct. 31, 2003.; Booth, 2006; Carville & Mitchell, 2001; Ehrlich-Martin, 2006; Furst-Bowe, 1997) and the limitations of using videoconferencing to teach full courses. Limitations include the difficulty of equal interaction for the on-site and remote students (Atkinson, 1999; BECTA, 2003; Booth, 2006; Bore, 2005; Tyler, 1999) and the communication, presentation, and teaching skills of the

presenter (Bitterman, Schappert, & Schaefer, 2000; Booth, 2006; Bore, 2005; Furst-Bowe, 1997; Heath & Holznagel, 2002). Cavanaugh's (1999) meta-analysis of 19 studies with 929 learners found that offering courses to distance learners "enlarges the course catalog and students' worldview at the same time" (p. 19), however foreign language is the subject area where distance education courses should be implemented with caution. Some studies (Baker, 2002; BECTA, 2003) found that videoconferencing did not afford any significant distractions from effective classroom practices and therefore using videoconferencing as a mode for delivery of high school courses is appropriate and deserves serious consideration by curriculum planning personnel. Another study found that videoconferencing is effective as a way to provide educational access to students in remote and rural locations, however, those with a greater need tend to be more tolerant of the medium than those that could get the education in other ways (Carville & Mitchell, 2001).

Interactivity is a theme that emerges throughout the literature (Amirian, 2003) and is critical to successful use of videoconferencing in all situations. In some studies, it is defined as simply the hindrance-free ability to actually communicate with the remote site (Atkinson, 1999; Carville & Mitchell, 2001). However Burke, Lundin, and Daunt (1997) challenged the simplicity of this definition by a study in which the two sites achieved a very high level of spontaneous interaction and were able to maintain it for a long period of time. In other studies, interactivity is defined more broadly to include constructivist methods of teaching and learning (Hayden, 1999; Sweeney, 2007) and asking questions, hands-on activities, and discussion (Haydock & Dennison, 2004). More research needs to be done on the role of interaction in K-12 settings (Heath & Holznagel, 2002).

Greenberg asserts that plenty of research has been done on the pedagogical worth of videoconferencing for learning; however further research is needed on the economic benefits of

reaching students, the ways collaboration fosters growth in understanding, assesses the return on investment, and brings to light why some programs and networks succeed where other do not (Greenberg, 2004). This study will begin to address the latter research need by examining the role of the videoconferencing coordinator in the implementation of videoconferencing.

Curriculum Videoconferencing

Curriculum videoconferencing includes accessing remote experts from the classroom (Greenberg, 2003; McCombs et al., 2007) and engaging in collaborative learning activities with remote classrooms (Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000; Howland & Wedman, 2003; Szente, 2003; Thurston, 2004; Yost, 2001). While there are anecdotal articles, informal case studies, and project evaluations for K12 videoconferencing, there are few research studies specifically on the use of curriculum videoconferencing in K12 schools (Anderson & Rourke, 2005). This section will examine the literature on the use of videoconferencing to connect to content providers and using videoconferencing for projects and collaborations with peers and international classrooms.

Content Providers

Content providers are organizations or groups that offer specialized content to schools. The programs can include virtual field trips, visits with experts, and cultural exchanges organized by educational organizations (Greenberg, 2003).

The studies make conflicting claims on the impact on student learning. Cavanaugh (1999) conducted a meta-analysis of 19 studies with 929 learners and found that "supplementing traditional instruction with distance education can enable more reality-based learning, with possible achievement gains" (p. 18). However, Anderson and Rourke suggest that the literature on how videoconferencing impacts student achievement is lacking and inconclusive (2005). In another conflicting example, one study focused on a content provider which offered

one hour interviews with people from other cultures. Lee (2004) found that while the programs offered students an introduction and exposure to people from other cultures, their understanding of the other cultures was shallow and stereotypical. On the other hand, anecdotal evidence (Morrison & Macquart, 2006) suggests that when done well and accompanied by preparation and post activities, the connections can increase empathy and understanding for people in other cultures and counties. A recent study comparing synchronous and asynchronous interactions with scientists found that while student learning was equal in both interactions, the students that interacted asynchronously were more thoughtful and reflective in their questions. The students who participated in synchronous interactions were more interested in the scientist as a person than the study at hand (Kubasko, Jones, Tretter, & Andre, 2007). These studies show that there are varying results and opinions on videoconferencing's impact on student learning.

While the impact on student achievement may be inconclusive, there are clear benefits to gaining access to experts. In 1996-1998 teachers in Ohio created lesson plans and action research projects to integrate community resources such as the Zoo and Center of Science and Industry in the curriculum. They found that videoconferencing allowed students and teachers direct access to specialists (Bruke, Beach, & Isman, 1997). An early content provider study was on a 128K ISDN connection from Colorado to New Jersey. Students accessed scientists in New Jersey over a 3-4 week period and the researcher concluded that the students' understandings of science and the work of scientists increased as a result of the contact with scientists (Shaklee, 1998). A more recent evaluation of Mote Marine Laboratory's videoconference programs found that videoconferencing offers students the opportunity to interact with real scientists which motivates student learning and encourages interest in science (Ba & Keisch, 2004). An evaluation of Vanderbilt University's program allows students to interview scientists and other experts found that videoconferencing can bridge the gap between

formal textbook learning and real world science (McCombs et al., 2007). Videoconferencing also allows content providers to bring their message and resources to K-12 schools (WMHO, 2002). The motivation and access to real-world practitioners is effective in the mathematics curriculum (Gage, Nickson, & Beardon, 2002) as well as higher education contemporary studies in tourism (Lück & Laurence, 2005). These studies only represent a small portion of over 250 content providers (AT&T, 2006; BCISD, 2008; CILC, 2008) offering interviews with scientists and programs by biologists, field researchers, and educational specialists. While benefits to student learning are emerging in the literature, additional research needs to be done on the use and effectiveness of content provider programs in the K-12 curriculum.

Projects and Collaborations

Many of the studies on curriculum videoconferencing are descriptions and studies on classroom-to-classroom collaborations, where teachers collaboratively design one or more activities for their students to participate via videoconference (Anderson & Rourke, 2005; Glaser, 2008). Projects, those classroom-to-classroom events coordinated by an individual or organization, are represented in opinion articles only (Glasgow & Zoellmer, 2003, March; Lim, 2003, January). Collaborations may take the form of a joint seminar, with the two classes meeting regularly for interaction (Martinez & MacMillan, 1998), or shorter one-time videoconference exchanges.

Many benefits can be found in these collaborations. Students may be challenged to identify their biases and learn from other viewpoints (Martinez & MacMillan, 1998). Sustained, multi-connection collaborations can bring greater cultural understanding (Cifuentes & Murphy, 1999; Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000) and increased student self-concept (Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000). One collaboration with the intention of increasing students' understanding of French uncovered complications in the difference between spoken and written French, which made the

collaboration difficult. However, students learned significantly from reviewing the videotapes of the interaction and analyzing the conversation with teacher assistance (Kinginger, 1999). Burke et al. found that a dialogical approach in multicultural exchanges encourages more interaction between learner and learner (1997). Even young elementary students benefited from sustained classroom-to-classroom collaborations as part of a ongoing unit on weather (Yost, 2001).

Most of these studies are of one teacher in a school doing one collaboration whereas some schools in this study are doing many events with many locations. Further research is necessary to examine the factors necessary to sustain these types of collaborations throughout the school year and involving a larger percentage of the teachers.

Implementation of Videoconferencing

A few studies have begun to examine the effective implementation of videoconferencing. Baber (1996) offers the Culture-Process-Technology approach as a framework for the successful implementation of videoconferencing in the corporate environment. The framework recommends:

> (1) that organizations should ensure that managers at all levels are willing to support the implementation process; (2) that videoconferencing "champions" be found to administer the system at the project level; (3) that operator training programs be developed to create a wide base of skilled end users; (4) that conference schedules be published regularly to inform end users of meeting times and to sustain ongoing interest in videoconferencing; and (5) that use of videoconferencing system features be consistently modeled to encourage the use of innovation and the re-invention of technology. (p. 128)

These essential components are evidenced in the literature as well. First, leadership support is critical. Keefe (2003), in a case study of one elementary school implementing videoconferencing, found that important components of a successful program included support from the technology committee and a collaborative decision making process within the school.

Second, the videoconference champion is key to the implementation of videoconferencing (Baber, 1996). The role of the coordinator or champion is the main focus of this study. Keefe (2003) found that the ability of the coordinator to assist teachers in integrating the technology in the curriculum was critical. In addition, Currie's (2007) study of videoconferencing within three regional service agencies in Michigan found that support of the administration was important for successful implementation of videoconferencing.

Baber's (1996) framework also suggests the need for operator training and modeling the use of videoconferencing features. Keefe (2003) suggested that the coordinator has an important role in staff development for new and experienced teachers. Currie's (2007) study of the implementation factors at the educational service agency level found that access to, awareness of, and actual participation in professional development was important in the success of the program. Bose (2007) studied the teacher, school, and professional development factors affecting the utilization of videoconferencing and found that professional development factors were important to predicting the use of videoconferencing.

Finally, Baber's framework suggests the need for a system for scheduling. This is another important role of the videoconference coordinator. Currie (2007) suggested that personnel at the local level to coordinate and schedule videoconferences is important to the success of the program.

Important implementation factors not addressed by Baber's framework include access to the videoconferencing equipment, the cost of programming, and the availability of programming offered by the regional service agency (Currie, 2007).

Because this study focuses on the role of the coordinator, Baber's framework will be adapted to focus specifically on how these factors affect the coordinator and utilization. Baber's "management support" will be defined in this study as financial, technical, and administrative

support for the coordinator. Baber's "modeling of videoconference features, scheduling, and professional development" will be included in Baber's definition of the role of the videoconference "champion" (coordinator). The role and characteristics of the "champion" (coordinator) will be divided into the coordinator's ability to support the videoconferencing, to integrate videoconferencing in the curriculum, and to work with teachers. Additionally, in this study the location of the equipment and the quality of the videoconference will be examined as variables that may affect the coordinator's ability to successful guide the implementation of videoconferencing.

Utilization

While a few key studies examine the implementation of videoconferencing in K-12 schools, the exact nature of a successful implementation is not defined. Implementation could be defined as using the instructional strategies properly (McDonald, 2007). However, since the field of curriculum videoconferencing is so new, this study will focus specifically on utilization. Given that curriculum videoconferencing brings benefits to the educational experience, it is logical to attempt to increase the use of videoconferencing, especially when schools invest thousands of dollars to install equipment. Therefore, this study will examine factors that can predict utilization.

Only two studies were found that examine utilization of curriculum videoconferencing. Currie (2007) studied the factors that impact videoconferencing within three regional service agencies in Michigan. His study examined overall usage including full length course delivery and curriculum videoconferencing. Not surprisingly, the regions with full length courses were using videoconferencing daily, whereas the schools under the service agency without full course delivery were using it less often. A more fair comparison would examine only one type of videoconferencing. The nature of curriculum videoconferencing dictates that it will not be used

daily; whereas the nature of full course delivery suggests a very high likelihood of daily use of videoconferencing. Nevertheless, Currie's study uncovered some important factors for implementation that will be examined in further detail in this study.

Another study by Bose examined the utilization of videoconferencing for professional development for teachers (2007). The study examined school characteristics, professional development characteristics, and teacher characteristics, and found that the teacher characteristics were more useful predictors of utilization. While this study focused on professional development via videoconferencing, the methods are similar to this study of utilization of curriculum videoconferencing and therefore will provide some insights and understanding.

Clearly there is a need to further investigate the implementation and specifically the utilization of curriculum videoconferencing in K-12 schools. This study begins to address that need.

Demographic Variables of the School

This section begins to address the variables involved in utilization in this study. The demographic variables of the school are not central to the study, but may show factors that influence the implementation of videoconferencing and therefore are included here.

The three major implementation studies examine some of the relevant school demographic variables. Currie examined the size of the school districts served and the socio-economic homogeneity of the school districts and found that these factors did not impact the success of the videoconferencing program (Currie, 2007). Keefe's case study focused on a school in a wealthy area with rich educational resources available to the school (2003); however in my pilot study I found that the schools with higher National School Lunch Scores used videoconferencing more than the schools with lower National School Lunch Scores (Lim,

2007). National School Lunch Scores are a recognized measure of poverty in schools. Bose examined the school's state in adoption of technology, number of teachers trained, school size, expenditure per pupil, and school location and found that these variables did not predict utilization (Bose, 2007). An additional variable included in my pilot study found that elementary schools used videoconferencing more than secondary schools (Lim, 2007). While Bose, Currie, and Keefe addressed some of the school demographic variables, research still needs to examine the relationship between these variables and the utilization of curriculum videoconferencing.

Other factors not found in the literature include the racial makeup of the school, and the population of the town where the city is located. These will be included in this study to obtain a broader picture of schools implementing videoconferencing.

The Role of the Videoconference Coordinator

A few studies have examined or mentioned the important role of the videoconference coordinator in a successful implementation of videoconferencing. Keefe's case study (2003) on one elementary school implementing a video learning center emphasized the necessity of a trained coordinator to support the teachers and make the connections. Wakefield's survey of 27 site facilitators (coordinators) on two videoconferencing listservs found that the roles of technical expert, instructional assistant, liaison, scheduler, and trainer were "a crucial part of the system in videoconferencing" (Wakefield, 1999, p. 49). Currie (2007), who studied study of three regional service agencies in Michigan recommended that school districts provide an individual who is in charge of facilitating videoconferences and can assist teachers in using videoconferencing in the curriculum. Bose (2007) found that the participant's prior confidence level with technology was a critical predictor of their utilization of videoconferencing. In addition, other studies have mentioned the role of the videoconference coordinator in making the videoconference successful (Ba & Keisch, 2004; Baber, 1996). These studies hint at the

importance of the videoconference coordinator and their role in a successful implementation of curriculum videoconferencing.

This study will examine specific characteristics of the videoconference coordinator: the demographics of the coordinator, the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing, to integrate videoconferencing in the curriculum, and to work with teachers. In addition, the technology factors of location and quality of the videoconference will be examined with the perspective of how these factors affect the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing. Finally, the role of technical, financial, and administrative support for the coordinator will be addressed.

Demographic Variables of the Coordinator

While Wakefield's (1999) study examines the site facilitator (coordinator) roles, no demographic variables were collected. Wakefield emphasizes the necessity of training and the method the training was delivered, but does not examine the type of training. Wakefield hinted that the position and other responsibilities of the facilitator may be important, but did not examine these factors in detail.

Clearly the site facilitator (coordinator) is important to the success of videoconferencing, but additional demographic information needs to be studied. This study will include the gender, race, age, and level of education, as well as the job title, years of experience in education, years of experience in videoconferencing, and time commitment to videoconferencing. These variables were not found in the literature. To further examine the importance of training, the hours of training received will be collected as well as what type of training was received, meaning mostly technical training or mostly curriculum integration training.

The Coordinator's Ability to Support Videoconferencing

Many skills and abilities are included in this category of supporting videoconferencing. Bose (2007) found that the comfort level with technology in general was an important predictor of utilization of videoconferencing. Wakefield (1999) found that the most prominent role of the site facilitator was that of technical expert, which includes comfort with videoconferencing, the use of the controls, conducting test calls, and the ability to make the connection work. The ability to stay during the videoconference as well as explain the videoconference technology to the students is another important part of supporting videoconferencing. Several studies found that the mediator (coordinator) at the remote site can help the learners by interfacing with the technology and modeling appropriate participation (Atkinson, 1999; Carville & Mitchell, 2001; Wakefield, 1999). In addition, a working system for scheduling videoconferences is a critical component of successful implementation (Baber, 1996; Wakefield, 1999). Each of these components are included in this study's definition of the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing.

The importance of the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing is represented well in the literature, but further research is necessary to determine if this ability predicts the utilization of videoconferencing in the school.

The Coordinator's Ability to Integrate Videoconferencing in the Curriculum

Integration of any technology in the curriculum requires a thorough knowledge of the possibilities, the curriculum, and methods of preparing and engaging students in the lessons. Studies show this is important in videoconferencing as well. Pre-planning and preparation for the videoconference are critical to success (Amirian, 2003; Cifuentes & Murphy, 2000; Kinginger, 1999; Sweeney, 2007). In addition, connecting videoconferencing to the course curriculum can provide a rich and educational experience for students as well as opportunities for situated learning and construction of knowledge (Fee & Fee, 2005). Preparation of the students is

important too. Students have varying levels of interest and motivation for using videoconferencing; and some students even react badly to the technology (BECTA, 2003; Tyler, 1999). Therefore it is important that the coordinator be able to assist students by orienting them to the technology and modeling appropriate participation (Atkinson, 1999). The coordinator also needs to know how to find and select appropriate content for the curriculum (Greenberg, 2003).

The literature shows the importance of the coordinator's ability to integrate videoconferencing in the curriculum; however research is needed to determine if this characteristic of the coordinator is important in predicting the schools' utilization of videoconferencing.

The Coordinator's Ability to Work with Teachers

Teachers need support to participate in videoconferencing and to integrate new strategies in their teaching. The faculty need assistance with using the technology and adapting their teaching for videoconferencing (Amirian, 2003). Units of instruction that involve multiple videoconferences and a significant amount of preparation can be challenging for teachers due to the constrictions on the curriculum schedule due to high stakes testing (Gage et al., 2002). Even though the teachers may see the benefit of the videoconference, they may struggle to find time for the videoconferences. A coordinator assisting with preparation and technology can make it easier for teachers to participate in videoconferences. Bose found that teacher and professional development characteristics were useful to predict utilization of videoconferencing (Bose, 2007).

It is clear from the literature that the coordinator needs to be able to support teachers as they integrate a new technology; however research needs to be done to determine if this characteristic predicts the level of utilization in the school.

The Coordinator and the Technology

While the preceding sections are directly related to the coordinator, this section examines two specific technology factors that may hinder the coordinator's ability to support videoconferencing in the school. Those factors are the quality of the videoconference and the location of the videoconference equipment.

The quality of the videoconference can affect the user experience. Low or unreliable bandwidth can make videoconferencing unreliable for educational purposes (Anderson & Rourke, 2005; BECTA, 2003). It is likely that the quality of the audio or video in the videoconferencing predict utilization, but this has not been studied for K-12 curriculum videoconferencing.

In addition, access to the videoconferencing technology is essential (Anderson & Rourke, 2005). The location of the system may affect access by teachers and the coordinator. This study will add to the body of literature an understanding on how the location of the videoconferencing equipment was decided, the satisfaction with the location and determine if any of these factors predict utilization.

The Coordinator's Access to Support

As the coordinator attempts to support videoconferencing in the school, it is important that the coordinator is also supported with technical and administrative support. support. Baber's framework (1996) suggested that managers have a key role to supporting the implementation of videoconferencing. They provide motivation for people to use videoconferencing and also create the administrative structure for actually implementing videoconferencing. The lack of consistent administrative support in one of the sites in the study led to failures in the cultural, process, and technical components of the implementation. Anderson and Rouke (2005) agree that leadership and a vision for all participants is an

important key to success. Specifically, that support should include a budget for videoconferencing (Currie, 2007), principal support for videoconferencing, as well as a technology infrastructure to support videoconferencing (Keefe, 2003). In addition, Currie (2007) suggests that educational service agencies should offer programming for their schools.

These administrative and technical supports for the coordinator or site facilitator are important, but have not been studied in relation to the utilization of videoconferencing in the school.

Summary

The literature suggests many important issues for the implementation of videoconferencing; however, these issues have not been systematically studied in relation to the utilization of curriculum videoconferencing in K-12 schools. The role of the videoconference coordinator and their ability to support videoconferencing, integrate it in the curriculum, and work with teachers is evidently critical to the successful implementation of videoconferencing. In addition, technical and administrative support factors are likely important factors to the implementation of videoconferencing. Recent studies have just begun to analyze the utilization of videoconferencing in schools (Bose, 2007; Currie, 2007), and further research is necessary to add to the body of knowledge. The research on curriculum videoconferencing is still new and inconclusive (Anderson & Rourke, 2005), therefore much more research needs to be done. School administrators may see the benefits and value of curriculum videoconferencing for meeting educational goals, but they need assistance in designing a successful implementation. This study will attempt to fill part of that need by investigating the videoconference coordinator and their role in promoting the utilization of curriculum videoconferencing.

This chapter briefly examined the literature on videoconferencing and curriculum videoconferencing. Then the review summarized the literature on the implementation of

videoconferencing, and detailed the role of the videoconference coordinator. In the next chapter, the methodology for the study will be described.

REFERENCE LIST

Amirian, S. (2003). *Pedagogy and videoconferencing: A review of recent literature* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://oit.montclair.edu/documentationpdf/amirian_megacon.pdf

Anderson, T., & Rourke, L. (2005). *Videoconferencing in kindergarten-to-grade 12 settings: A review of the literature*. Retrieved from http://www.vcalberta.ca/research/index.cfm

AT&T (2006). *Videoconference adventures*. Retrieved from http://www.kn.pacbell.com/wired/vidconf/adventures.html

AT&T (2007). *Videoconferencing for learning*. Retrieved from http://www.kn.att.com/wired/vidconf/

Atkinson, T. R., Jr. (1999). *Toward an understanding of instructor-student interactions: A study of videoconferencing in the postsecondary distance learning classroom.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 9925524)

Ba, H., & Keisch, D. (2004). *Bridging the gap between formal and informal learning: Evaluating the Seatrek distance learning project*. Retrieved from http://cct.edc.org/report_summary.asp?numPublicationId=177

Baber, J. R. (1996). *Re-visioning corporate communication: A case study of videoconferencing implementation.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 9700122)

Baker, D. R. (2002). *Teacher perceptions of the educational outcomes for direct instruction compressed video classroom environment within remote classrooms at the secondary school level.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3056384)

BCISD (2008). *Videoconference program database*. Retrieved from http://bcisdvc.org/

BECTA (2003). *What the research says about video conferencing in teaching and learning*. Retrieved from http://publications.becta.org.uk/display.cfm?resID=25801

Booth, G. W. (2006). *High school students' experiences taking a calculus course through video conferencing: A case study.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT NR13923)

Bore, J. C. (2005). *Distance education in the preparation of special education personnel: An examination of videoconferencing and web-based instruction.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3196134)

Bose, M. (2007). *Influencing the utilization of videoconferencing technology: Teacher, school and professional development characteristics.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3271340)

Bruke, M., Beach, B., & Isman, A. (1997). Learning community link: Enhancing learning using telecommunication technologies. *THE (Technological Horizons in Education) Journal, 25*(1). Retrieved from http://www.thejournal.com/

Burke, C., Lundin, R., & Daunt, C. (1997). Pushing the boundaries of interaction in videoconferencing: A dialogical approach. *Distance Education, 18*(2), 349-360. doi:10.1080/0158791970180210

Carville, S., & Mitchell, D. R. (2001). It's a bit like Star Trek: The effectiveness of video conferencing. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 37*(1), 42-49. doi:10.1080/135580000362070

Cavanaugh, C. (1999). The effectiveness of interative distance education technologies in K-12. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 7*(1), 73-88.

Chapman, D. S. (1999). Expanding the search for talent: Adopting technology-based strategies for campus recruiting and selection. *Journal of Cooperative Education, 34*(2), 35-41.

Cifuentes, L., & Murphy, K. L. (2000). Promoting multicultural understanding and positive self-concept through a distance learning community: Cultural connections. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 48*(1), 69-83. doi:10.1007/BF02313486

CILC (2008). *Content provider programs.* Retrieved from http://www.cilc.org/c/education/content_provider_programs.aspx

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Currie, N. J. (2007). *A study of the factors that impact videoconferencing as a learning tool within three regional service sgencies in Michigan*. Unpublished dissertation. Oakland University, Rochester, MI.

Dudding, C. C. (2004). *Perceptions of the use of videoconferencing for supervision: Differences among graduate students.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3108759)

Fee, S., & Fee, L. (2005). *The pedagogical value of videoconference technology.* Paper presented at the World Conference on Educationa1 Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2005, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/

Fiege, K. H. M. (2005). *Educational researchers using real-time videoconferencing to collaborate: Thoughts and feelings shared.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT MR09088)

Freed, S., & Lim, J. (2006). *We have the videoconference equipment installed, now what?* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gage, J., Nickson, M., & Beardon, T. (2002). *Can videoconferencing contribute to teaching and learning? The experience of the Motivate project*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002264.htm

Gilham, C., & Moody, B. (2001). Face to face: Videoconferencing creates opportunities for incarcerated youth. *Journal of Correctional Education, 52*(1), 29-31.

Glaser, R. (2008, February 1, 2008). *Videoconference glossary*. Retrieved from http://www.edlink12.net/vcrox/2008/02/01/videoconference-glossary/

Glasgow, D., & Zoellmer, D. (2003, March). TWICE connects readers across America via two-way videoconferencing. *MACUL Newsletter*. Retrieved from http://www.macul.org/

Greenberg, A. (2003). *Best practices in live content acquisition by distance learning organizations*. Retrieved from http://www.polycom.com/common/documents/whitepapers/best_practices_in_live_content_acquisition_by_distance_learning_organizations.pdf

Greenberg, A. (2004). Navigating the sea of research on videoconferencing-based distance education: A platform for understanding the technology's effectiveness and value. Retrieved from http://www.wainhouse.com/files/papers/wr-navseadistedu.pdf

Greenberg, A. (2006). *Taking the wraps off videoconferencing in the U.S. classroom: A state-by-state analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.wrplatinum.com/content.aspx?CID=5912

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Hartman, H., & Crook, B. (1997). Faculty development videoconferences: What we have learned. *T.H.E. Journal, 24*(8), 69-72. Retrieved from http://www.thejournal.com

Hayden, K. L. (1999). *Videoconferencing in K-12 education: A Delphi study of characteristics and critical strategies to support constructivist learning experiences.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 9934596)

Haydock, P. G., & Dennison, J. A. (2004). *Assessing the needs of K-12 audiences in synchronous educational videoconferencing*. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning. Retrieved from http://www.dlt.ncssm.edu/distance_learning/forms/AssessNeedsInIVC.pdf

Heath, M., & Holznagel, D. (2002). Interactive videoconferencing: A literature review. *K-12 National Symposium for Interactive Videoconferencing*. Retrieved from http://neirtec.terc.edu/K12vc/resources/litpolicy.pdf

Howland, J., & Wedman, J. (2003). *Experiencing diversity: Learning through videoconference technology*. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2003, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/

ISTE (2007). *National educational technology standards for students: The next generation*. Retrieved from http://www.iste.org/

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1988). *Student achievement through staff development*. New York, NY: Longman.

Keefe, D. D. (2003). *A case study of the integration of a video learning center at an elementary school*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3091163)

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kinginger, C. (1999). Videoconferencing as access to spoken French. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 468-489.

Kinnear, H., McWilliams, S., & Caul, L. (2002). The use of interactive video in teaching teachers: an evaluation of a link with a primary school. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 33*(1), 17-26.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kubasko, D., Jones, M. G., Tretter, T., & Andre, T. (2007). Is it live or is it Memorex? Students' synchronous and asynchronous communication with scientists. *International Journal of Science Education, 30*(4), 495-514. doi:10.1080/09500690701217220

Lee, M. M. (2004). *Going global: The complexities of fostering intercultural understanding in a rural school using videoconferencing technology*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3141606)

Lim, J. (2003, January). MysteryQuest video conference exercises give middle school students a reason to research. *MACUL Newsletter*. Retrieved from http://www.macul.org/

Lim, J. (2007). *A study of the implementation of videoconferencing in 35 schools in southwest Michigan*. Unpublished data.

Lim, J. (2007, September 28). *Curriculum videoconferencing*. Retrieved from http://bcisdvcs.wordpress.com/2007/09/28/curriculum-videoconferencing/

Lück, M., & Laurence, G. (2005). Innovative teaching: Sharing expertise through videoconferencing. *Innovate, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www.innovateonline.info/

Martinez, M. D., & MacMillan, G. (1998). *A joint distance learning course in American government*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED428005)

McCombs, G. B., Ufnar, J. A., & Shepherd, V. L. (2007). The virtual scientist: Connecting university scientists to the K-12 classroom through videoconferencing. *Advances in Physiology Education, 31*(1), 62-66. doi:10.1152/advan.00006.2006

McDonald, S. R. (2007). *Characteristics leading to a successful implementation of laptop computers: A case study.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3255301)

McGinnis, V. L. C. (2001). *Examining the effects of tutoring sixth-grade math students at a distance using videoconferencing.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3038257)

McNeil, K. A., Newman, I., & Kelly, F. J. (1996). *Testing research hypotheses with the general linear model*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

McNeil, K. A., Newman, I., & Steinhauser, J. (2005). *How to be involved in program evaluation: What every administrator needs to know*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.

Mitchell, L. S. (2005). *Learning through laughter: A study on the use of humor in interactive classrooms.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3171414)

Morrison, J., & Macquart, D. (2006). World's youth connect through Global Nomads Group: An interview with GNG's David Macquart. *Innovate, 2*(4). Retrieved from http://www.innovateonline.info/

Newman, I., & McNeil, K. A. (1998). *Conducting survey research in the social sciences*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Newman, I., Newman, C., Brown, R., & McNeely, S. (2006). *Conceptual statistics for beginners* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

O'Leary, Z. (2005). *Researching real-world problems: A guide to methods of inquiry*. London: SAGE.

Pemberton, J., Cereijo, M., Tyler-Wood, T., & Rademacher, J. (2004). Desktop videoconferencing: Examples of applications to support teacher training in rural areas. *Rural Special Education, 23*(2), 3-9.

Royal, K., Bradley, K., & Lineberry, G. T. (2005). Evaluating interactive television courses: An identification of factors associated with student satisfaction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/summer82/royal82.htm

Shaklee, J. M. (1998). *Elementary children's epistemological beliefs and understandings of science in the context of computer-mediated video conferencing with scientists.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 9902429)

Straessle, G. A. (2000). *Teachers' and administrators' perceptions and expectations of the instructional consultation role of the library media specialist*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 1400457)

Sweeney, M. A. (2007). *The use of videoconferencing techniques which support constructivism in K-12 education.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 3257352)

Szente, J. (2003). Teleconferencing across borders: Promoting literacy and more in the elementary grades. *Childhood Education, 79*(5), 299-304.

Thurston, A. (2004). Promoting multicultural education in the primary classroom: broadband videoconferencing facilities and digital video. *Computers and Education, 43*(1-2), 165-177. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/

TWICE (2007). *Videoconferencing collaborative projects.* Retrieved January 13, 2008 from http://www.twice.cc/projects.html

Tyler, C. (1999). Beyond the content - videoconferencing. *Speaking English, 32*(2), 15-27.

Wakefield, C. K. (1999). *Site facilitator roles in videoconferencing: Implications for training.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation. (AAT 9960871)

Wegge, J. (2006). Communication via videoconference: Emotional and cognitive consequences of affective personality dispositions, seeing one's own picture, and disturbing events. *Human-Computer Interaction, 21*(3), 273 - 318. doi:10.1207/s15327051hci2103_1

Weiss, T., Whiteley, C., Treviranus, J., & Fels, D. I. (2001). PEBBLES: A personal technology for meeting educational, social and emotional needs of hospitalized children. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing, 5*(3), 157-168. doi:10.1007/s007790170006

WMHO (2002). Videoconferencing exposes students to new worlds. *T.H.E. (Technological Horizons in Education) Journal, 29*(8), 53-54. Retrieved from http://thejournal.com/

Yost, N. (2001). *Lights, camera, action: Videoconferencing in kindergarten*. Paper presented at the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference, Norfolk, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED457846)

Young, T. L., & Ireson, C. (2003). Effectiveness of school-based telehealth care in urban and rural elementary schools. *Pediatrics, 112*(5), 1088-1094.